

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated September 8, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this response, claim 27 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 27 and 33 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,147,667 to Yamazaki et al. (hereinafter “Yamazaki”) in view of Single-Crystal Si-Films via a Low Substrate Temperature Excimer-Laser Crystallization Method by Sposili et al. (hereinafter “Sposili”).

The rejection of claims 27 and 33 as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Sposili is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 27 is allowable over Yamazaki in view of Sposili in that the structure of claim 27 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a controller unit in the third region of the first substrate, wherein the pixel array, driver circuit and controller unit are integrally located on the first substrate, and wherein the controller unit includes an active layer formed of single crystalline silicon in which silicon grains have a length beyond a single-pulse lateral growth distance and is grown by single-pulse lateral growth process” and “the controller unit including CPU, RAM, ROM, IC, resistors, capacitors, oscillators, and connectors, the CPU, RAM, ROM, IC, resistors, capacitors, oscillators, connectors being formed on the first glass substrate by the same process.”

The cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of the claimed invention as recited in amended independent claim 27. As pointed out in MPEP §2143.03, “all claim limitations must be taught or suggested.” Thus, “to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA1974).” Because the cited

Application No.: «AppNumber»
Amdt. dated «Current_Date»
Reply to Office Action dated

Docket No.: «CaseNumber» «SubCase»

references fail to teach at least the above features of claim 27, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 33 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claim 33 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that it depends from claim 27, which, as discussed above, is allowable.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any

Dated: December 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant